AN EXPLANATION AND VINDICATION OF THE RUBRICKS

Before the

New OFFICE

FOR THE

Eleventh Day of JUNE.

More particularly

As they Concern the Festival of St. *Barnabas*, *Whitsun Tuesday*, and *Trinity Sunday*.

OXFORD:

Printed for S. WILMOT, *Oxon*; J. and J. KNAPTON, R. KNAPLOCK, and T. ASTLEY in *St. Paul's Church-Yard*, and W. BICKERTON, without *Temple-Bar*, *London*, 1731. Price 6*d*.

BRITISH MUSEUM

THE

PREFACE.

THE Reader may be pleas'd to obſerve, that in the following Papers I meddle not with the Conteſt between the Archdeacon of *Canterbury* and the Reverend Mr. *Johnſon*, in relation to the Office for the Acceſſion Day in the Year 1715. Had it ſo happen'd, that the Service for an *Apoſtle's* Day had been then ordered to be wholly omitted, that learned Author would probably have inſiſted ſomewhat more largely upon the Point of reading *alias*

preces & alio modo. But without either Favour or Prejudice to his Argument on that Subject, I here take it for granted, that the Office of Thankſgiving is enjoined by ſufficient Authority; and upon that Suppoſition, I have undertaken to vindicate the *Rubricks* by which that Office is introduced. After all, the Caſe is not ſo extraordinary, as at firſt Sight it appears to be; nor is the proper Office for St. *Barnabas*'s Day to be wholly omitted, in how ſtrong Terms ſoever it may ſeem to be ſo directed by the *Rubrick*: For there is yet a fourth *Rubrick*, which orders that *Morning* Prayer ſhall begin with certain Sentences, and no Order at all is given for *Evening* Prayer; whence it neceſſarily follows, that the proper Office for the Feſtival of St. *Barnabas* muſt ſtill be uſed at the *Evening*

Service

Service for that Day; ſince I cannot ſuppoſe it to be intended, either that there ſhall be no *Evening* Service on that Day, or that it ſhall be without both a firſt and ſecond Leſſon. And when the Leſſons for that Feſtival *muſt* be read, 'tis to be hoped, that the Collect *may* be read alſo. But whether, upon the publick Notification of the *Acceſſion-Day*, it be neceſſary or proper to notify withal, that the *Afternoon* of the ſame Day is to be obſerved as the Feſtival of St. *Barnabas*, I will not be poſitive, but ſubmit it to the Determination of better Judgments.

There is lately come to our Hands a new Edition of the Forms of Prayer for the Fifth of *November*, the Thirtieth of *January*, and the Twenty-ninth of *May*; at the Delivery of which

which the Apparitor in ſome Places demanded and received Half a Crown. The only Amendments of Note in the whole Book are, that on the Fifth of *November*, in the Title, and in two of the Collects, inſtead of [*His late Majeſty*,] we are to read [*His Majeſty King* William;] and in another Prayer, inſtead of [*thy Servant our late King*,] we are to read [*thy Servant King* William.] But with Submiſſion, I think, there might have been an Amendment made to one of the *Rubricks* in the ſame Office. Mr. *Johnſon*, before mentioned, in the 84th Page of his Caſe, ſays, that *the Form for the* Fifth *of* November, *was put into its preſent Dreſs, by he knows not whom, ſoon after the Revolution.* King *William*'s Order concerning it bears Date at *Kenſington, Oct.* 18. 1690. Now as this Form had ſtood from

from 1662. there was a Prayer to be uſed as a ſecond Collect for Morning Service, which at this Time was removed, to make Room for another of a more modern Date. As we were engaged in a War with *France*, when this Affair was in hand, and this Prayer had in it the following Expreſſions, *Abate their Pride, aſſwage their Malice, and confound their Devices*, it was ordered to be read *inſtead* of the Prayer *in Time of War and Tumults*; it continued ſo in the ſucceeding Reigns, both before and after the Union; and ſo it continues in this laſt Edition. By plain Conſequents from hence, it is not now to be read in Times of Peace and Tranquillity; and if the Reviſers of this Office intended it otherwiſe, they would have done well to frame the *Rubrick* accordingly.

To

To prevent Miſtakes, it is to be noted, that in the following Treatiſe the Year of our Lord is ſuppoſed to begin on the Firſt Day of *January*.

A N

AN Explanation and Vindication OF THE RUBRICKS Before the New OFFICE FOR THE Eleventh Day of JUNE.

THE Form of Prayer with Thankſgiving, to be uſed every Year upon the Eleventh Day of *June*, being the Day on which his Majeſty began his happy Reign, is introduc'd

by three *Rubricks*; the firſt of which is as follows:

THE Service ſhall be the ſame with the uſual Office for Holy Days in all Things, except where it is in this Office otherwiſe appointed.

THIS *Rubrick* is Word for Word the ſame with that which is commonly publiſh'd upon theſe and the like Occaſions, and therefore it may be well thought not to be liable to any Exception. Indeed, if we conſider it by itſelf, there is no Exception to be made to it; but if it be compared with the *Rubrick* next following, there will ariſe a ſmall Scruple, which it may be proper to remove. We ſhall be obliged hereafter more largely to examine the Direction, for wholly omitting on this Day the proper Office for the Feſtival of St. *Barnabas*. In the mean Time it muſt be obſerved, that in the firſt Year of our ſolemnizing this Day of Thankſgiving, it happened to be in the *Ember* Week; and it will happen ſo ſeven Times more, before it once happens to be *Trinity* Sunday, as it is ſuppoſed in the Third *Rubrick* it may poſſibly be

be. As to the Queſtion, whether it be the Intention of our Church, that one of the Collects relating to Ordination ſhall be read only on the three *Ember* Days, or on every Day in *Ember* Week, I believe the Practice varies, and ſhall not take upon me to determine the Point. However that be, it will ſo fall out, that in the preſent Year 1731. and in the Year 1742. the Eleventh of *June* will be the *Friday*, and in 1774. it will be the *Wedneſday* in *Ember* Week; and conſequently, if the Day were to be regarded as the Feſtival of St. *Barnabas*, the Ordination Collect would be then read, as it always uſed to be on that Day, as alſo on the Feaſts of St. *Matthias*, St. *Matthew*, and St. *Thomas*, whenever any of them happened to be on an *Ember* Day. But as now the proper Office for St. *Barnabas* is to be wholly omitted, the Queſtion is, Whether the Ordination Collect muſt be dropp'd in the three Years above named, as alſo in the Years 1739, 1747, 1758, and 1769. ſuppoſing that the ſaid Collect ought to be read on every Day in *Ember* Week?

But this Difficulty will, I think, admit of an eaſy Solution. For ſince the Ordination Collect is plainly no Part of the proper Office for the Feſtival of St. *Barnabas*, but altogether extraneous and adventitious to it, as it is to ſeveral other, both Feſtivals and common Days in the Year, it is not order'd to be omitted by the ſecond *Rubrick*; and therefore it is to be read, according to the Tenor of the firſt *Rubrick*, foraſmuch as it is not *in this Office otherwiſe appointed.*

The ſecond *Rubrick* is conceived in theſe Words:

THIS Day being the Feſtival of the Apoſtle St. Barnabas, *the proper Office for that Day ſhall be wholly omitted, and this uſed inſtead of it; and there ſhall be Notice thereof given publickly in the Church the Sunday before.*

It is pretended, that in this *Rubrick* there are both an *Impropriety* and an *Obſcurity*. The ſuppoſed *Impropriety* in it, is, that it directs us wholly to omit the proper Office for the

the Feſtival of the Apoſtle St. *Barnabas*. But thoſe who make this Objection, would do well to conſider, whether they certainly know how to diſpoſe not only of St. *Barnabas*, but of ſeveral other *Saints*, when their Feſtivals ſhall happen to be on *Common Sundays*. I ſay *Common Sundays*, for that *Eaſter* Day ſhall take place of St. *Mark*, or of the *Annunciation*; that *Whitſunday*, or *Trinity Sunday* ſhall take place of St. *Barnabas*, and *Advent Sunday* of St. *Andrew*, I ſuppoſe no Body will diſpute. But when a *Common Sunday* and another *Holy Day* ſhall coincide, whether of the two Offices is to be preferr'd? I am ſure there are Difficulties on either Side: For if it be ſaid, that the Office for the Holy Day is to take place, as, according to the more uſual Practice, I believe it does, then it will follow, that on the Feaſts of St. *Paul*, the *Purification*, St. *Matthias*, the *Annunciation*, St. *Mark*, St. *Philip*, and St. *James*, St. *Barnabas*, St. *Peter*, St. *James*, St. *Bartholomew*, St. *Matthew*, and *All Saints*, an *Apocryphal* Chapter muſt take place of a *Canonical* one, for the firſt Leſſon both at Morning and Evening Service, as it muſt alſo do at Evening Service for the

the Feaſts of the Holy *Innocents* and St. *Luke*. It is well known how ſtiffly the Diſſenters object to us, that we do at all read any *Apocryphal* Leſſons in the Church; and one of the Anſwers commonly given, is, That this can be no Reaſon for their not coming to Church on *Sundays*, becauſe no *Apochryphal* Leſſon is order'd to be read on any *Sunday* throughout the Year. But this Anſwer will ſomewhat ſink in its Value, if there can come no Year, wherein there will not at leaſt be one *Sunday* on which *Apocryphal* Leſſons are to be read; and that when the Dominical Letter is E, the Caſe will happen five ſeveral Times. On the other hand, if the Office for the *Sunday* muſt take place, what ſhall we do in many Caſes for ſecond Leſſons? For ſince there are proper ſecond Leſſons appointed for Morning and Evening Service on the Feaſts of St. *Paul*, St. *Barnabas*, St. *John Baptiſt*, St. *Peter*, and *All Saints*, as alſo for Morning Service on the Feaſt of St. *Philip* and St. *James*, * in all which

* Not to mention, that there are proper ſecond Leſſons appointed alſo, and Blanks left in the Kalendar, for the Feaſts of St. *Stephen*, St. *John the Evangeliſt*, the *Circum-*

which Caſes there is a Blank in the Column of ſecond Leſſons againſt the Day of the Month in the Kalendar; though we ſhould uſe all the reſt of the Office appointed for the *Sunday*, yet we muſt of Neceſſity read the ſecond Leſſon for the Holy Day, or have none at all; for I hope no Body would preſume to chuſe one by his own private Authority. Suppoſe then * St. *Paul*'s Day to be the third *Sunday* after *Epiphany*, or *Septuageſima Sunday*, the firſt Leſſons muſt be thoſe out of *Iſaiah* or *Geneſis*, which are appointed

---

Circumciſion, and the *Epiphany*. Of theſe Feaſts three may be on the firſt, and the other on the ſecond *Sunday* after *Chriſtmas*, for which *Sundays* there are proper *firſt* Leſſons appointed. In the laſt Review, proper ſecond Leſſons were appointed for St. *Michael*, and yet thoſe in Courſe ſtill kept their Place in the Kalendar; whether deſignedly, or by Over-Sight, I am not able to judge. This is certain, that it might eaſily have been contrived otherwiſe. For though by leaving Blanks on that Day, the ſecond Leſſons would for ſome Time have been thruſt back, yet by reading (as we are elſewhere order'd) either the firſt Chapter of St. *Luke* in *October*, or the ſeventh of the *Acts* in *December*, all at once, and the ſecond and third Epiſtles of St. *John* both together in *December*, all would have been brought right at the Year's End.

*. St. *Paul*'s Day may alſo happen to be *Sexageſima Sunday*; but that can be only thrice in 532 Years, *viz.* when *Eaſter* Day falls on the 22d of *March*, and it is not a Leap-Year. The laſt Time of its falling ſo, was in the Year 1573. and the next will be 1915.

pointed for the reſpective *Sundays*; but the ſecond Leſſons, if we have any, muſt be thoſe out of the *Acts of the Apoſtles*, which are appointed for St. *Paul's* Day. Thus again, when the Feaſt of St. *Barnabas* ſhall happen to be the firſt or ſecond *Sunday* after *Trinity*, if the Caſe be not over-ruled by this Day of Thankſgiving, the firſt Leſſons muſt be read out of *Joſhua* or *Judges* for the *Sunday*, but the ſecond out of the *Acts* for the Holy Day.

It will be ſaid, that though theſe Conſiderations may make it difficult to determine whether of the two Offices is to be *wholly uſed*, yet they do not prove that either of them is to be *wholly omitted:* For though it be not the Deſign of our Liturgy, that upon any Occaſion there ſhould be four *Leſſons* read, either at Morning, or at Evening Service, or that two different Portions of Scripture ſhould be read for *Epiſtles*, and two others for *Goſpels*, on the ſame Day; yet there is not the leaſt Incongruity for the *Collect* of one Day to be added, in its proper Place, to the Office of the other: So far from it, that we are often expreſly commanded to do

do ſo; for Inſtance, from *Chriſtmas Day* to *New-Year's Eve*, in the Seaſons of *Lent* and *Advent*, and upon the Fifth of *November*, if that Day ſhall happen to be *Sunday*. From which laſt Inſtance 'tis obſerved, that the Collect for St. *Barnabas* would no more have diminiſhed or interrupted our hearty Thankſgiving for his Majeſty's Acceſſion to the Throne, than the Collect for a common *Sunday* abates the inward Senſe of our great Deliverance from the Gunpowder Plot.

To all which I anſwer, that though we have frequent Rules for adding the Collect of one Day to the Office of another; and though it be the uſual, if not univerſal Practice (without any expreſs Rule for it, that I know of,) to do the ſame Thing as often as * any *Sunday* and *Holy Day* coincide; yet what is mentioned from the *Rubrick* for the Fifth of *November*, is the only Inſtance, that I remember, of that kind on any Day of Thankſgiving upon a State Account. If the Twenty-

*For I ſee no Inconvenience in adding the Collect for the *Annunciation* or St. *Mark* to the Office for *Eaſter Day*; nor that for St. *Barnabas* to the Office for *Whitſunday* or *Trinity Sunday*.

ninth of *May* ſhall happen to be any common *Sunday*, *this whole Office*, ſays a *Rubrick* for the Day, *ſhall be uſed, as it followeth, entirely*; not only *entirely*, without Omiſſion, but alſo *as it followeth*, without Addition or Mixture: So that here the Office for the *Sunday* is wholly dropped. In the later Reigns, the *Rubricks* before the Offices for the Sixth of *February*, the Eighth of *March*, and the Firſt of *Auguſt*, plainly direct us, that *if the Day ſhall happen to be* Sunday, *the proper Office for that* Sunday *ſhall be wholly omitted.* The third *Rubrick* for the Eleventh of *June* is to the ſame Tenor, and runs very nearly in the ſame Words with the third *Rubrick* for the Twenty-ninth of *May*, with this Difference, that Proviſion is made for a Caſe, which might happen to the Day laſt-named, but could not to the other, to wit, that it might be *Aſcenſion Day*. By comparing all theſe *Rubricks* together, it evidently appears, that in the Year 1732. the Collect for the Firſt *Sunday* after *Trinity*, and in 1738. that for the Second *Sunday* after *Trinity*, is to be omitted.

Now

Now will any one inſiſt, that in thoſe Years the *Collect* for St. *Barnabas* ſhould have been ordered to be uſed, while that for the *Sunday* is ordered to be omitted? If it had been ſo ordered, the *Collect* for the *Apoſtle* would plainly have been preferred to that for the *Sunday*; in which Caſe, I muſt confeſs, that if I had as fully conſidered the Point, as I have now done, I ſhould have thought it better Authority, than any I can yet find, for preferring the whole Office for a *Saint's Day* to that for a *Sunday*, upon all ſuch like Occaſions. But till that Queſtion is decided, the Deciſion whereof might here perhaps be purpoſely avoided, they ſeem to ſtand on the ſame Foot, and to have an equal Claim; and conſequently both *Collects* are to be uſed, or both omitted. It has been the moſt uſual Courſe, as appears by the *Rubricks* before cited, to omit that for the *Sunday*: The ſame Thing is now ordered again; and therefore, by Parity of Reaſon, that for the *Saint's Day* is to be omitted alſo.

The *Obſcurity* with which this *Rubrick* is charged, is grounded upon the latter Part

of it, concerning the Notice, which is to be given publickly in the Church the Sunday before. It is demanded, whether the Word *thereof* be relative to the Words *this Day*, or to the Antecedent next before it, which is the Clauſe for wholly omitting the Office for St. *Barnabas*. If it be the latter, as ſome really take it to be, and as, according to the ſtrict Rules of Grammar, many others ſay it ought to be, this ſeems to bear too hard upon the *Apoſtle*; and it would ſurely have been enough wholly to drop the Obſervation of his Day, without obliging the Clergy expreſly and ſolemnly to notify before-hand to their Congregations, that it was to be ſo dropped.

In Anſwer to which, I acknowledge, that the Compilers of the *Rubrick* might have expreſſed themſelves more clearly; but, at the ſame Time, I contend that they meant no more, than that this previous Notice ſhould be given of the Acceſſion Day. Of this any one may ſatisfy himſelf, by comparing the *Rubrick* with thoſe for the Acceſſion Days of other Princes, which have been already named: For thus they all run; *If this Day*

ſhall

ſhall happen to be, &c. *But however* it *ſhall happen, there ſhall be Notice* thereof *given*, &c. If this fair and reaſonable Interpretation ſhall not be allowed, and a Scruple ſhall ſtill remain with any Perſon, as if this were not doing ſo much as the preſent *Rubrick* ſeems to require of him, let it be conſidered, that by giving Notice for the Obſervation of the *King*'s, and taking no Notice at all of the *Apoſtle's Day*, it is ſufficiently intimated, that the Office for the former is to be uſed, and that for the latter to be omitted. Nor will this be acting inconſiſtently with the *Rubrick* next after the *Nicene Creed*, which enjoins the Curate to declare unto the People, what Holy Days are in the Week following to be *obſerved*. But this does not affect the Caſe in hand, ſince the *Obſervation* of the Feaſt of St. *Barnabas* is at preſent ſuſpended; and conſequently, while it continues to be ſo, the *Notification* of the Day muſt be underſtood to lie under the ſame Suſpenſion.

The Third *Rubrick* before the Office for the Eleventh of *June*, runs thus:

If

If this Day ſhall happen to be Whitſunday, *the Collects of this Office ſhall be added to the Office of that Feſtival in their proper Places. And if* Monday *or* Tueſday *in* Whitſun-Week, *or Trinity Sunday, the* proper Pſalms *here appointed for this Day, inſtead of thoſe of ordinary Courſe, ſhall be alſo uſed, and the* Collects *added as before: And in all theſe Caſes the reſt of this Office ſhall be omitted. But if it ſhall happen to be any other* Sunday, *this whole Office ſhall be uſed as it followeth, entirely. And what* Feſtival *ſoever ſhall happen to fall upon this ſolemn Day of* Thankſgiving, *the* Hymn *appointed inſtead of* Venite exultemus *ſhall be conſtantly uſed.*

As *Aſcenſion* Day can never fall later than the Third of *June*, no *Sunday*, or other *moveable Feaſt* can poſſibly fall on the Eleventh of that Month, for which particular Proviſion is not made by this *Rubrick*. Theſe Proviſions are exactly the ſame with thoſe, which were made by a *Rubrick* for the Twenty-ninth of *May*, as it was corrected in the Firſt Year of King *James* II. and has continued

tinued ever ſince ; and therefore one would think, there could lie no Objection againſt our preſent *Rubrick*, which did not equally affect the other. But, however, it ſeems, ſome curious Perſons will needs fancy, that they have diſcovered a material Difference between them, becauſe it appears, upon Computation, that *Trinity Sunday* cannot fall on the Eleventh of *June* before the Year 1777.

The ſeveral Caſes, ſay they, which were put in the original *Rubrick* for the Twenty-ninth of *May*, might properly be ſuppoſed to happen during the Life of King *Charles* II. Accordingly that Day did happen to be *Whit-ſunday* in the Year 1664. *Trinity-Sunday* in 1670. *Aſcenſion-Day* in 1679. and *Tueſday* in *Whitſun-Week* in 1683. And if that Prince had lived to enter the 70th Year of his Age, as his Predeceſſor Queen *Elizabeth* did, he would alſo have ſeen the Day of his Birth and Reſtauration to be the *Monday* in *Whitſun-Week* in 1699. But if any of theſe Caſes, when it was firſt put, had been at the greateſt Diſtance poſſible, yet it would have been not improperly put, ſince the Obſervation of the Day was not intended to be confined

fined to one Reign, but *that Day in every Year is by Act of Parliament appointed to be for ever kept holy.*

To this they add another Remark, concerning the Sixth Day of *February*, on which King *James* II. began his Reign. It was foreſeen by thoſe, who drew up the Form of Prayer for that Day, that within ten Years, *viz.* in 1695. it would happen to be *Aſh-Wedneſday.* Upon this extraordinary Occaſion, as theſe Gentlemen are pleaſed to inform us, it was neither directed that the Offices for *Aſh-Wedneſday* and the *Acceſſion Day* ſhould be blended together into one, nor that the proper Office for *Aſh-Wedneſday* ſhould be *wholly omitted;* but it was prudently ordered that the Office of *Thankſgiving ſhould be performed the Day before.* By this Proviſion the *Carnival* would conclude with a Feaſt of Thankſgiviug, and *Lent* would begin, as uſual, with ſolemn Faſting and Humiliation. Queen *Anne* aſcended the Throne on the Eighth of *March*, which Day may alſo happen to be *Aſh-Wedneſday;* but no Notice is taken of this in the *Rubricks* for the Day. It is ſuggeſted, that this could

not

not fall out through Forgetfulneſs, ſince the former Inſtance was then ſo freſh; and that it was the leſs likely to be forgotten in the Queen's Time, becauſe the Sixth of *February*, which was her Father's Acceſſion Day, was alſo her own Birth Day. They inſiſt therefore, that this Omiſſion could have no other Cauſe, but that it had been calculated, that *Aſh-Wedneſday* would not fall on the Eighth of *March* before the Year 1755. and that it was not thought convenient to flatter her Majeſty with the Hopes of ſeeing any Part of the Ninety-firſt Year of her Life.

We are now enter'd upon a Point of a very tender and ſerious Nature, which muſt be handled accordingly. It is, no doubt, the Duty of all good Subjects to wiſh and pray for the long Life of their Prince. On the other hand, a good Prince will not be offended with thoſe of his Clergy, who in Compliance with another Duty ſhall ſometimes humbly put him in Mind of his Mortality. I hope, therefore, I may be pardon'd, if I obſerve, that of all our Crown'd Heads ſince the Conqueſt, the longeſt Liver hitherto has

been Queen *Elizabeth*. And my Lord *Bacon* reckons it amongſt the Felicities of her Reign, that as ſhe very nearly reach'd to the compleat Age of Man, ſo ſhe did not out-live herſelf, nor ſully her former Glories by falling into a State of Dotage, which had in ſome Meaſure been the Caſe of the renown'd King *Edward* III. in a leſs advanc'd Period of Life. I know, indeed, Mr. Archdeacon *Echard*, by an unaccountable Miſtake, would fain perſuade us, that King *Henry* I. lived many Years longer: For at the Entrance into that King's Reign we are told, that he was then about forty two Years of Age, and at the End of it, that he deceas'd in the ſeventy eighth Year of his Age. The ſame Author, cloſing up the Reign of Queen *Elizabeth*, has obſerved, that ſhe died in the ſeventieth Year of her Age; to which Age, ſays he, no King of *England*, but one (meaning no doubt *Henry* I.) ever arrived. But all this is contrary to the Accounts of all our Hiſtorians, who unanimouſly agree, that *Henry* I. was born in *England* after his Father's Acceſſion to the Throne; and Mr. *Echard* himſelf having ſaid, that he was about two and forty when he came to the Crown, own within

within four Lines, that he was of *Engliſh* Birth, and had both a King and a Queen to his Parents. Let us then allow to the utmoſt Extremity, and ſuppoſe that the Duke of *Normandy*, far from being ſure of Succeſs in his Enterprize upon *England*, brought over with him his Lady, then juſt ready to lie in, and that ſhe was deliver'd of this Son the very Day after the Battle of *Haſtings*, namely, *Oct.* 15. 1066. From thence to *Auguſt* 1100. when he began his Reign, he could be but in the thirty-fourth Year of his Age; and on *December* 2. 1135. when he died, he could not be ſixty nine Years and two Months old, which falls four or five Months ſhort of the Age of Queen *Elizabeth*. But the Truth is, if we may believe *William* of *Malmesbury*, and *Robert* of *Glouceſter*, this Prince was born in the third Year of his Father's Reign; according to which Monſieur *de Rapin* has rightly concluded, that he died in the ſixty eighth Year of his Age.

But what if this be ſo? It does not become us to go about to limit the Age of our Princes, or indeed of the meaneſt private

Subject. It may be ſeen by the Weekly Bills, that the Lives of ſeveral Perſons exceed ninety Years; and if none of our Crown'd Heads have as yet reach'd to Seventy, it does by no Means thence follow, that none ever ſhall reach to Ninety four. It will appear by and by, that the Caſe in Hand is not parallel to that of Queen *Anne*; and that there was not ſufficient Reaſon why the *Rubrick* of the Eighth of *March* ſhould, in this Reſpect, be a Precedent for the *Rubrick* of the Eleventh of *June*.

But before we can proceed, we are ſtopp'd by another Obſervation: *If this Day*, ſays the Rubrick, *ſhall happen to be Tueſday in Whitſun Week*; that is, ſay ſome, preciſely the ſame Thing, as if it had been ſaid, *If this Day ſhall ever happen at all.* Foraſmuch as it appear'd by the then current Almanacks, that if ever it *did* happen, it *would* be *Tueſday* in *Whitſun Week*; and by Computation it is as certain, that it will happen ſo no more till 1812. at which Time his Majeſty, if then living, will be in the 129th Year of his Age.

Upon

Upon this Occaſion, I ſhall take leave to put a Caſe to theſe Gentlemen who are ſo liberal of their Computations. Suppoſe it had pleaſed God to continue the late King to us for one Year longer, and that he had died on the Eleventh of *June* 1728. I make no doubt, but that upon this Suppoſition the *Rubrick* would have been exactly the ſame as it now is, and not without a plauſible Reaſon for it. The Eleventh of *June* will be *Monday* in *Whitſun Week* in 1739. and it will be *Whitſunday* in 1755. Proviſion muſt have been made for both theſe Caſes; and it would have look'd very oddly, that while the Service was regulated for the *Sunday* and *Monday*, there was no Care taken of the *Tueſday*, eſpecially ſince every Body would remember, that the Day happen'd to be *Whitſun Tueſday* in 1728. and not one in ten thouſand would ſuſpect that it would happen ſo no more, till eighty four Years were expired.

Thus again, ſince we ſee, that when *Eaſter* Day falls on the Twenty-firſt of *April*, the Eleventh of *June* will be *Tueſday* in *Whitſun*

Whitſun Week, it is eaſy to perceive, that when *Eaſter* Day falls on the Sixteenth of *April*, the Eleventh of *June* muſt be *Trinity Sunday*, and when on the Twenty-third, or Twenty-ſecond of *April*, the Eleventh of *June* will be *Whitſunday* or *Whitſun Monday* reſpectively. Now whoever conſults the Rule to find *Eaſter* for ever, may ſoon diſcover that this great Feſtival falls oftener on the Sixteenth, than on the Twenty-firſt or Twenty-ſecond of *April*, by the Proportion of five to three; or than it does on the Twenty-third, by the Proportion of five to two. Would it not then have ſtrangely excited every one's Curioſity, if Directions had been given, how far this Office of Thankſgiving was to have been uſed, when the Day ſhould happen to be *Whitſunday*, or the *Monday* or *Tueſday* in that Week? and we had not been directed what to do, when it ſhould happen to be *Trinity Sunday*, though that Caſe falls out much more frequently than any of the others? Who would not have been inquiſitive to know the Reaſon of this? and who would not have been ſcandaliz'd, if no other Reaſon could have been offer'd, but that the Compilers of the *Rubrick* ſeem'd to envy

their

their Grandchildren the Happineſs of ſeeing his preſent Majeſty on the Throne in the 94th Year of his Age?

Now with Relation to the Office for the Eighth of *March*, it was a quite different Thing, *Aſh-Wedneſday* being the only Day, except common *Sundays*, which could interfere with that Day of Thankſgiving. This Caſe was not put, and ſcarce any one took notice of the Omiſſion; whereas if it had been put, it would probably have ſet many Perſons at work, to compute when it would happen; and upon Diſcovery, that it could not happen in the Queen's Time, except ſhe lived into the 91ſt Year of her Age, I fear there would have been enough ready to cry out upon it, as an *unneceſſary* and extravagant Compliment upon ſo ſerious an Occaſion.

Thus I have endeavour'd to vindicate theſe *Rubricks* from all the Objections againſt them, which have come to my Knowledge. If any of my Readers continue unſatisfied, and ſtill urge, that ſome of the Particulars mention'd could not have been ſo order'd, but by Neglect or Over-Sight, they muſt go on to enjoy the Opinion, with this only Reflection, That many

ſmall

ſmall Errors may be corrected by a candid Interpretation: For Inſtance, we are told in the Title Page to this Form of Prayer, that it is to be uſed in all Churches and Chapels within *this Realm*; yet no Body imagines that it is thereby deſign'd to be uſed in *Scotland*. And by his Majeſty's Command, it is to be uſed in all Pariſh-Churches and Chapels within his *Kingdom of England*, though there be now no ſuch Kingdom; yet I believe this Miſtake would hardly be allow'd to excuſe any, who ſhould omit it in an *Engliſh* Pariſh-Church or Chapel. Theſe Stiles are taken, as indeed the whole Form of Prayer is, *mutatis mutandis*, from the old Books compoſed on ſuch like Occaſions before the *Union*, and are to be underſtood accordingly. Indeed I am inclin'd to think, that many of the foregoing Obſervations would have been ſpared, had the *Apparitors* contented themſelves with their uſual Fees for diſperſing the Books. But as in ſome Dioceſſes they ſurpriz'd the Church-Wardens with larger Demands, it gave Riſe to this Remark, That it was unreaſonable to give Half a Crown, or Three Shillings, for an Order, *wholly to omit the proper Office for the Feſtival of the Apoſtle St.* Barnabas.

FINIS.

BRITISH MUSEUM